

**Summary of Changes and Actions  
Regarding BDCP Other Stressor Conservation Measures  
(January 29, 2009 Other Stressors Subgroup Meeting)**

The Other Stressors Subgroup met on January 29, 2009, to further evaluate and refine the proposed list of conservation measures (CM) provided in the October 31, 2008 Other Stressors Conservation Measures handout to the Steering Committee. The subgroup focused its review of the CM around three questions:

**Q1** = Question 1: Will the CM happen because BDCP took an action?

**Q2** = Question 2: Will the CM provide a meaningful benefit to covered fish species?

**Q3** = Question 3: Will BDCP receive “credit” from Fishery Agencies for implementing CM? (“credit” could be either formal regulatory credit or other less formal credit from Fishery Agencies for providing benefits to species).

For each question:

Y=Yes

N=No

U=Uncertain

For several CMs, it was determined that additional information or clarification was needed before making a determination regarding each question. This table provides a summary of the initial response to the questions, the type of implementation, and notes where further consideration is warranted.

<b>CM code</b>	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Type of Implementation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
OSCM1 Ammonia	U	U	U	Funding	An “if, then” measure - if research determines adverse effects, then action will be taken. This measure is not a BDCP responsibility, but BDCP could support funding.
OSCM2 Endocrine Disrupters	U	U	U	Funding	An “if, then” measure - if research determines adverse effects, then action will be taken. This measure is not a BDCP responsibility, but BDCP could support funding.
OSCM3 Methyl-mercury	U	U	U	Funding	Questionable as to benefit to fish. Human health issue.
OSCM4 Pesticides Herbicides	Y	U	Y	Funding, Direct Action	[question regarding existing TMDL – SAIC to inquire and provide more specificity in CM]

CM code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Type of Implementation	Comments
OSCM5 Urban Run-off Contaminants	Y	Y	Y?	Direct Action	If effective, incremental from local programs. Credit not clear cut. May not be cost effective. Need to check with cities as to actual funding shortfalls and specific programs that could be funded. Identify funding level (blank).
OSCM6 Toxic Spill Response	Y	Y	Y	Funding	[rechecking with DFG on need for this CM]; BDCP would be funding an additional focus of the program (currently only on oil)
OSCM7 Ship Channel Oxygen	N	Y	N	Funding, Direct Action	Not a BDCP responsibility? A USACE and Port of Stockton responsibility. SAIC will investigate if habitat restoration near ship channel could improve DO.
OSCM8 Blackwater discharge	U	N	U	Direct Action	Delete this measure – minor issue and minor benefit; already regulated under F&G Code and Water Quality Code. DFG and RWQCB responsibility.
OSCM9 Ballast Water - Hull Fouling	Y	Y	Y	Funding	Keep CM. Needs more study and development. Need to better understand Coast Guard and State Lands programs effectiveness and funding levels.
OSCM10 Recreational Inspection	Y	Y	Y	Funding	Keep
OSCM11 Invasives Response Team	U	U	U	Funding	DFG to re-write or delete (Carl W). Could be costly relative to benefits, may already be addressed. Cost could be somewhat off-set if combined with OSCM6 (in OSPR ready response)
OSCM12 Zebra-Quagga	Y	Y	Y	Funding	Keep. Provide funding to make happen. Identify who will implement CM? DFG possibly, but local agencies implement and DFG approves
OSCM13 Egeria	Y	Y	Y	Funding	Keep. Provide funding to expand program
OSCM14 Non-natives Fishing Regs	N	Y	N	Regulatory	Keep. Regulatory change by F&G Commission
OSCM15 Salvage Fish Predators	N	Y	N	Funding	Delete CM. Already in OCAP BO, so part of baseline. Near-term benefit only.
OSCM16 Illegal Harvest	Y	Y	Y	Funding	Keep. Additional funding of DFG warden positions.
OSCM17 Splittail	N	Y	N	Regulatory	Keep. Regulatory change by F&G Commission

CM code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Type of Implementation	Comments
OSCM18 HGMPs	U	Y	U	Regulatory, Funding	Already requirement for USBR to implement HGMPs. Requirement to fund will be in OCAP BO, so part of baseline. Need to add more specificity regarding each State and Federal hatchery, some may benefit from augmented or accelerated funding.
OSCM19 Mark-Select	U	U	Y	Regulatory, Funding	Fish Agencies to provide more comments regarding total vs. fractional marking and mark select benefits/drawbacks
OSCM20 Smelt Hatchery	Y	Y	Y	Funding	Keep
OSCM21 Non-Project Diversions	Y	Y	Y	Funding	Keep
OSCM22 No-Wake Zones	Y	Y	Y	Regulatory, Funding	Keep

#### Notes

##### Key Points from meeting:

- DFG concurs that there is structure with the existing text of each OSCM to ensure that the measures will happen and that there is accountability.
- If programs are already established, effective, and funded, then BDCP cannot get credit and CM should be dropped. If programs are short on funding and BDCP could augment funding to cause or accelerate implementation, then BDCP could receive credit for CM.
- Should regroup the OSCMs to reflect the different types of CMs (e.g., direct actions, regulatory changes, actions dependent on initial identified research)
- CM to be reviewed and refined to strengthen understanding of implementation and to reflect regrouping by action type.
- SRCSD is O.K. with text of OSCM1 and OSCM2 as written.

Meeting Participants: Brent Walthall (KCWA), Carl Wilcox (DFG), Laura Simonek (Metropolitan), Laura King Moon (SWC), Will Stelle (Resources), Paul Cylinder (SAIC), Linda Dorn (SRCSD)